

JK 1323

1857

.T8



PRICE 15 CENTS : to be had of the author, in Washington City, and of the principal book stores

1343
1809
73

HISTORY

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF THE

THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS,

1855--1857,

BY F. F. C. TRIPLETT.

(Copyright secured according to law in the Washington District Court.)

WASHINGTON :
HENRY POLKINHORN, PRINTER.
1857.

ADVERTISEMENT.

For having expressed my opinion under oath that many measures of the last Congress were influenced by mercenary considerations, the House of Representatives *falsely* declared that I was one of its reporters, in order *falsely* to assert that I had violated the obligations of one. Without a moment's notice that any charge was contemplated against me, I was arraigned, tried, and convicted in two minutes. There was no honest man in or out of Congress, acquainted with the facts, who did not pronounce it a gross and dastardly outrage. Such a proceeding, however, would naturally commend itself to the favor of the conductor of Harper's Magazine, the literary Jack Shepard of the day. Accordingly he varied his usual occupation of pilfering other people's labors by publishing, under pretence of a report, an original falsification of this Congressional falsehood, and when his attention was called to it, made amends by republishing the same untruth with a variation. As I am no author and he has consequently never had the opportunity to steal any production of mine, I cannot conceive the motive of his hostility.

Under these circumstances I am compelled to come forward in my own vindication, and I know no better way of effecting this than to give a truthful history of my accusers. I shall, with a fearless hand, tear the veil from every act of corruption I can ferret out, and I invite all who are acquainted with facts bearing on this subject, to aid me with their knowledge. But I shall not confine myself to this disgusting branch of the History of the House. Many important measures were passed upon, many important principles discussed, many interesting scenes enacted, and these I shall endeavor to present in the same impartial manner which I think all will accord at least to the *political* presentations of this first part.

May 6 1875
HISTORY

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

292
492

OF THE

THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS,

1855-1857,

BY F. F. C. TRIPLETT.

(Copyright secured according to law in the Washington District Court.)

WASHINGTON :
HENRY POLKINHORN, PRINTER.
1857.

HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE THIRTY-FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Election of Speaker.

The 34th Congress of the United States convened at Washington city on the first Monday (3d day) of December, 1855, and at 12 o'clock the House of Representatives was called to order by John W. Forney, the clerk of the preceding House. It was composed of two hundred and thirty-four members and seven delegates, all of whom, except eight of the former and two of the latter, answered to their names. The first business in order was the election of a Speaker, and as the various parties had held their preliminary caucuses, or at least had had free conferences, nominations were promptly made.

The first was that of Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, a gentleman liberally endowed by nature, of pretty general cultivation, not unversed in politics, having for some years been an ardent Democrat, then elected to Congress as a Whig, whence Mr. Fillmore sent him as Commissioner to China, after his recall from which mission by Mr. Pierce, he now appeared again upon the stage, acting with that latest sect which aimed to supersede old party organizations by new tests. Cogent in sustaining his own views, prompt in replying to others; always fluent, sometimes eloquent, with great kindliness of manner, and no bigoted devotee of persons or opinions; he had many admirers and no enemies. His claims were pressed by that branch of the Know Nothing party afterwards distinguished as National Americans.

A few of these, however, together with a small number of the advocates of the restoration of the Missouri Compromise line, preferred Henry M. Fuller, of Pennsylvania, whose intellectual qualifications for the position were never so conspicuously displayed as were his loyalty to truth and his moral courage, on a subsequent occasion, which lost him the support

of his Freesoil friends and gained him the respect of all parties.

The National Democrats, always exhibiting the accurate drill of the camp, presented an unbroken front on William A. Richardson, of Illinois, who, devoid of eloquence, accomplishments, or personal polish, yet commanded support by his political boldness, his frankness and geniality in private life, and, above all, by his unflinching advocacy of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, if not by his consistent interpretation of its principles.

A large majority of the Republicans had agreed to unite on Lewis D. Campbell, of Ohio, a man then of more national reputation than any of his party in the House; bold and vehement in debate, yet personally acceptable to his adversaries; not capable, perhaps, of surveying the wide field of statesmanship, but seizing readily upon such objects as came within the sphere of his vision; who had gone, step by step, with his section, in their gradual progress from old-fashioned Whigism to modern Republicanism.

Perhaps it was this fact, that he had chosen rather to march with the column than to skirmish far in its front, which induced many of his own side at the outset to repudiate him and rally around Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, who had left the Democrats to join the Know Nothings, and was suspected in turn to have abandoned these, when he resolved to unite his with the more prosperous fortunes of Republicanism. Of grave and saturnine aspect, he combined great quickness of intellect with great coldness of heart; ambitious and self-involved, of happy delivery, chaste style, and an admirable renovator of cast-off ideas; flexible in seeming, yet firm of purpose; he would have held more than a middling station in any legislative body, and might well aspire to the first in the one into which he had been thrown.

Still another segment of the party acknowledged for their leader, Alexander C. M. Pennington, of New Jersey; but since, whatever may have been the original design, he in fact was used rather as a rack on which to hang the cloaks their

owners would resume in time, than as a living personage in the melee, it is unnecessary to characterize him, any more than others who occasionally served the same purpose.

On the first call, Richardson received 74 votes; Campbell, 53; Marshall, 30; Banks, 21; Fuller, 17; scattering, 30.* After fifteen votings had been taken, Mr. Marshall's name was withdrawn. The next vote stood, for Richardson, 73; Campbell, 62; Fuller, 21; Banks, 18; scattering, 44.†

On the 14th voting, (given Wednesday, December 5th) Mr. Campbell attained eighty-one votes; but, finding himself constantly declining in strength after that, immediately succeeding the 23d call, he withdrew his name under this remarkable explanation: "It is obvious to me that it is impossible for my friends to succeed unless I can perform one of three conditions; to repudiate my well-known principles in reference to slavery, my views on Americanism, or in some way, directly or indirectly, to make pledges with regard to the forming of committees, which will amount to a sacrifice of my self respect, and make me, in my opinion, a fit object for public contempt."‡ Eight days afterwards, when pressed to reveal the secrets of this base intrigue, he refused to be put on the the witness' stand, as he termed it, but emphatically declared, "I am responsible, not only to those with whom I act politically, but to my political opponents, for everything I uttered on that occasion; I take not back one single word; I bide my time, sir, for explanations, if any are necessary."

The idea that any party seriously proposed to barter for a surrender of Mr. Campbell's principles, is simply preposterous. No man was so fatuous as to suppose that the motive of his defection from frequently and earnestly avowed convictions could for a moment be concealed, or that when it was understood, he could carry with him a single follower in the House or a single constituent at home to compensate for the infamy of the bargain. Nor was there any possible means of furnish-

*Congressional Globe, December 3d.

†C. G., December 6th.

‡C. G., December 6th.

ing the proposed reward. The Democrats had solemnly affirmed their determination to vote for no one who did not denounce free-soilism, Americanism, and all opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska act, and they could muster but seventy-five votes. The National Americans were still weaker than the Democrats, and would certainly never have supported an apostate from their party, even if he had the doubtful merit of deserting another at the same time. It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Campbell dragged in this impossible hypothesis to avoid the necessity of directly bringing out the true charge, that nineteen members, at least—for so many changes were necessary, on the ballot preceding his withdrawal, to secure his election—stood ready to sell their suffrages for positions on the committees, by which power or profit might be won for themselves.

I am aware that after this statement had been three weeks before the country, the subject of indignant comment by the press as well as in Congress, and after both the Democrats and the National Americans had defiantly repelled all idea of the charge resting upon them, Mr. Campbell essayed to break its force by declaring that no member had exacted or demanded pledges of him with regard to the forming of committees.* Whether the same object had been attempted through intermediate agents or whether the explanation was in that Pickwickian sense in which Congressional explanations are usually conceived, is yet to be revealed. Whatever prudential motives may have induced him to veil the truth, it was not concealed, for no one believed he would so gravely invent and so deliberately repeat a slander upon his colleagues, or attempt to raise his own reputation for integrity upon the treacherous ruin of that of so many of his own party.

There was now a plot and counter-plot between the friends of Mr. Pennington and those of Mr. Banks, if, indeed, as in the schemes to entrap Benedict and Beatrice into love, the identity of the plans does not prove that they originated in the

*C. G., December 27.

same mind. One of them is unfolded in a letter of Mr. Giddings to a paper published in his district, and afterwards copied into the N. Y. Tribune. "On Tuesday," says the letter—Mr. Campbell's highest vote was attained the next day—"on Tuesday, it was proposed to give Mr. Campbell as high a vote as we could, preparatory to leaving him and concentrating upon some other candidate. One gentleman of N. Y., informed me that it was agreed to go for Mr. Banks, of Massachusetts, next, and when we had given him as high a vote as we could, we should then elect Mr. Pennington, of N. J. He did not say by whom such agreement had been entered into. Mr. Campbell's vote was raised, by the efforts of Mr. Banks's friends, to 81; but Mr. Campbell's friends were unwilling to have him withdraw. They thought such a majority ought not to yield to a minority. But it should be borne in mind that this majority was in a large proportion made up of members who preferred other candidates, but who were induced to vote for Mr. Campbell in order to gratify him and his friends, and place him in a situation to withdraw honorably. As his friends did not withdraw his name, members began to lead off on to Mr. Banks, until Campbell's vote fell down to 45."*

According to this, the plan, it will be seen, was to fool Mr. Campbell to the top of his bent; then to please Mr. Banks with a ring or two of the rattle, and finally to concentrate upon and elect Mr. Pennington. But at this very same time Mr. Banks was meditating the same scheme of perfidy against his associates and co-laborers. On the 16th January, 1856, Mr. Dunn, of Indiana, stated in his place that, "after Mr. Campbell's name had been withdrawn, the friends of Mr. Banks did not wish that the anti-Nebraska men should concentrate their votes upon him at once. They wanted them to scatter or throw off, until it was seen that Mr. Pennington and other anti-Nebraska candidates should exhaust their force, and their election be found impracticable, and have their names withdrawn." Mr. Brenton, of the same State, who had been steadily voting

for Mr. Banks, said, “when Mr. Campbell’s name was withdrawn, the friends of Mr. Banks approached me and requested me not to vote for Mr. Banks now, *saying that Mr. Banks did not desire it*—that his friends were to vote for somebody else just then. I replied that I was afraid when Mr. Banks got ready I might not be ready, and I accordingly cast my vote for Mr. Banks, and continued to vote for him.” Mr. Pennington said he had been apprised that a *scheme* was concocted, in a certain quarter, to run him up to a certain point, and then drop him and kill him off out of the way of other candidates. At one o’clock at night he was obliged, in self-defence, to make his way through the dark passages of this city to the headquarters where he supposed this *scheme* was concocted, and there protest against “this foul and unnatural murder.” No denial or explanation was attempted.

It is true that Mr. Sage, of N. Y., known as an obsequious tool of Mr. Banks, solemnly declared he had voted in good faith for Mr. Pennington, but he had a few minutes before with equal solemnity affirmed that he uniformly voted for Mr. Campbell until that gentleman withdrew his name, while Mr. Dunn showed from the record that his first eleven votes were for Mr. Banks, then six for Mr. Campbell, at the very time it was proposed to *gratify* him with a vote to withdraw upon, then four for Mr. Pennington, and then two for Mr. Campbell, after it had been shown they could do that gentleman no good. Mr. Sage’s friends were not astonished at his hardness of assertion, nor himself abashed at its exposure, since it was not the only *lapsus* in which he was detected during the day.

And here I cannot omit remarking upon the mistaken views of party leaders in general, who employ the best talents at their command in the exposition of their principles and policy, content to leave the often more important duty of supporting these by timely fabrications to the lowest intellects. But in truth, the latter office requires by far the subtlest genius; for men listen, in political discussions, only to that which favors their previous convictions, with not much more discrimination

between absurd sophistry and keen argumentation than an ostrich makes between a brickbat and a French roll, while an ill-conceived falsehood injures the usefulness of the bungling *artist*, and brings some contempt upon his cause.

Immediately after Mr. Campbell's withdrawal, Richardson received 71 votes; Banks, 41; Fuller, 19; Pennington, 18; scattering, 80; of which more than sixty were Republican. This lack of concentration was owing, doubtless, chiefly to the management just disclosed, but partly to the fact that there were some Know Nothing members anxious to support Mr. Banks, who yet feared to do so without some assurance that their peculiar views on Americanism would not be disregarded in the organization of the House. It was probably to quiet their fears that the arrangement shadowed in the following resolution adopted in a secret meeting headed by Mr. Giddings, was made: "That we will support no man for Speaker who is 'not *pledged* to carry out the parliamentary law, by giving to 'each proposed measure ordered by the House to be committed, 'a majority of such special committee; and to organize the 'standing committees of the House by placing on each a *majority of the friends of freedom*, who are favorable to making 'reports on all petitions presented to them.'"* Which meant, as Mr. Giddings explained, that "when a Know Nothing brings forward a proposition to change or repeal the laws of naturalization, he is entitled to a respectful hearing." So, he continued, are Anti-Know Nothings, pro-slavery, and anti-slavery men, and all classes and parties. As, however, even Mr. Banks could hardly promise to give the friends and opponents of foreign immigrants' suffrage, each, a majority of the Judiciary Committee, or the friends and opponents of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, each, a majority of the Territorial Committee, it is probable the pledge privately exacted was less comprehensive than the interpretation publicly given.

Mr. Campbell denied that any such test had been proposed to him, thus making it certain that the negotiation he had denounced referred to particular persons, and not to general

*C. G., December 18, 1855.

policy, about his views of which, indeed, neither Republicans nor Know Nothings could entertain any doubt. Mr. Banks blandly repelled all knowledge of the meeting, the resolution and the pledge, though the gentlemen so solemnly committed to support no *unpledged* person continued to vote for him. And Mr. Giddings protested that the pledge he had spoken of was one to be gathered from the past history, and not the present promises, of the candidate. Surely never was midnight meeting called for so little purpose as that which bound this gentleman and his friends to sustain none other than a Republican candidate, unless, indeed, apprehensive of being tempted beyond their strength by the Delilah of pro-slaveryism, they deemed it necessary to secure their virtue by a public vow, and take the Nation to witness that no blandishments should seduce them to support one known to be hostile to the Wilmot Proviso.

Whatever were the object of the resolution or the nature of the assurances received under it, all idea of rallying under any but Mr. Banks were speedily abandoned, and he rose to 86, to 100, and on the 11th of December to 107, in the near neighborhood of which he remained until the contest closed.

On the 19th of December, sixty-four votings having been had, Mr. Fuller, apprehending his position not to be correctly understood, voluntarily declared, That he had supported the compromise measures of 1850; that had he been in Congress at the time, he would have voted against the Kansas-Nebraska bill, as deeming it an unwise provocation of renewed agitation on the slavery question; that for the same reason he would now vote against its repeal; and that he would vote for the admission of Kansas, if her application were otherwise regular, without reference to her decision to admit or to prohibit slavery. A member from his State promptly declared, if he had known these to be Mr. Fuller's views, he would rather have lost an arm than accorded him his support, and all his freesoil adherents at once deserted him. The declaration itself had been superinduced by an animated debate then going on in the House,

the object of which was to determine the party that was properly responsible for its continued disorganization.

The Republicans contended that it was absurd to expect them to yield their candidate, upon whom they had concentrated more votes than any other division of the House upon its own. That they constituted the true National party, since they represented a majority of the majority of the people of the Union, which majority was sustaining the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence; inaugurated in the ordinance of 1787; carried out by the early action of the Constitutional Government, and approved by all the fathers of the Republic. That the Democrats were essentially sectional, basing their party upon the one idea of slavery-propagandism, in doing which they had forced the compromise of 1820 upon the North; had unsettled this by that of 1850, which they premised should be a finality, and now, in violation of justice and good faith, were requiring their dupes to submit to another pretended finality, in the Kansas-Nebraska bill. They complained, too, that, that was a measure of delusion, for while they of the South held that it carried slavery into every Territory, its Northern adherents claimed that this institution could be planted in such Territory only by a direct vote of its inhabitants, and hence that the free States would retain all they possessed before, and gain south of the old compromise line. Finally, that they would vote for no one who would not restore to the North the rights violated by the Kansas-Nebraska iniquity.

The Americans urged that it was impossible for them to coalesce with the Republicans, who were stirring up a fierce sectional strife, and founding all their hopes upon the perpetuation of geographical divisions. That many of this party had crept into their councils at the North, pretending to advance their views whilst solely intent on their own, and having by this means acquired power, openly derided those whom they had betrayed. That, without inquiring into a man's past opinions, they, (the Americans,) received him into fellowship, if he would discountenance all future unfraternal discussions on slavery,

would abide by the present legislation on that subject as a finality, and would recognize the right of each Territory, when applying for admission as a State, to regulate this matter for itself. That this principle, for the present overshadowing in importance all others, since it involved the perpetuity of the Union, and not simply the mode of conducting its affairs, presented a common ground on which they and the Democratic party might have united in organizing the House, had not the latter rudely and insultingly cut off all chance of accommodation, by pronouncing, in their nominating caucus, "the party known as Know Nothings," to be the enemies of civil and religious liberty. That under these circumstances, they could not without dishonor vote for the nominees of that caucus, nor for any one who participated in its deliberations.

The Democrats derided the claim to Nationality of the Republicans, who were engaged in a contest against the institutions of half the States ; who had not voted and would not vote for any Southern man, whilst all their Southern Members were uniting with fifteen from the North in support of a Northern candidate. That their principles were, the preservation of State equality, of religious freedom and of the rights of foreign born citizens. Against the first the Republicans openly warred ; against the last two, the Americans in secret and oath-bound associations. To abandon their candidate and present another entertaining the same views, could conciliate no support ; to present or to accept one of different views would be to dissolve their organization and prove derelict to their well settled convictions. Hence, being in a minority and consequently not responsible for the conduct of affairs, they had no compromises to offer, and no terms to make.

Mr. Dunn, of Indiana, who voted for Mr. Banks through the day of Mr. Campbell's withdrawal, thenceforward absolutely refused to do so, for which he had been virulently assailed. This refusal he predicated upon the arrogant determination of that gentlemen's friends to force him upon the party, without regard to his strength or to the claims of others, and

also upon the dishonorable means (some of which he could not communicate without breach of confidence) used to secure his success.

Other personal altercations occurred, and personal explanations were made. Mr. Allison, of Pennsylvania, (Republican,) concurred with his colleague, Mr. Jones, (Democrat,) though for a different motive, that in their State, Know-Nothingism and Free-Soilism went hand in hand; while Mr. Campbell, of the same State, (K. N.,) utterly denied this, declaring that himself voted for Mr. Banks, not because he was anti-Nebraska, but because he was the impersonation of Americanism. Yet the latter's claim to Americanism was, on the other hand, vehemently repelled—a question he did not think proper to settle. When taunted, however, with having expressed his willingness, under certain circumstances, to “let the Union slide,” he professed a pious zeal for that Union, the only danger to which he detected in the aggressions of the South. And Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, perhaps not unwilling that such expressions should come more generally into vogue, since the greater the numbers that use them, the fewer are left to ridicule them, sharply reprovéd the illiberality which condemned in Mr. Banks what himself and they would be the first to avow under reversed circumstances.

Silent voting, noisy debate, general (and, it may be *particular*) pledges, having failed to combine a majority on any candidate, resort was now had to direct bribery. John J. Pearce, a member from Pennsylvania, approached Mr. Millward, of the same State, who had been steadily voting for Mr. Fuller, with an offer that if he, Millward, would vote for Banks, he would make “a good thing of it,” that is, as he explained it, Mr. Banks would make him chairman of the Committee on Engraving and Lithographing.* Mr. Millward at once† brought the matter to the notice of the House, by whom it was re-

*Id. 27 December.

†As some unsophisticated persons may not understand how “a good thing” could be made of this position, a word of explanation may not be out of place. A member of the House, though not of the committee, explained to

ceived with shouts of laughter, as the most comical event of the session. But, for the benefit of a few gentlemen, who could not appreciate the wit of the proposition, Mr. Banks disclaimed his agent's authority, and Mr. Pearce consented to assume the double infamy of having attempted to bribe a fellow-member, and of having attempted to bribe him with a fraudulent promise. He admitted having made the promise; he admitted having asked Mr. Banks for authority to offer Mr. Millward a consideration for his vote, but said that that virtuous gentleman answered—what the reader must be satisfied of by this time—that he could make no pledges!*

me what would be the process, (and he was seeking at the time to effect an arrangement about a bid then, he said, pending before the committee,) in this wise: we find, for instance, from the report of the Superintendent of Public Printing, (Miscellaneous Documents H. R., 3d session, 34th Congress, No. 14,) that for the engravings accompanying the reports of the Commissioner of Patents on Arts and Manufactures, and on Agriculture, the Senate paid \$10,844,31. Now suppose the same or any other contractor had offered to furnish the same engravings for the copies ordered by the House, at the same price, which was evidently a remunerative one, and another contractor asks for the same job \$41,629,57, which was what the House Committee paid, here is a difference of \$30,785,26, to be distributed by the *successful* bidder as a bonus among his *more successful* employers. Every reader will understand that the whole cost of an engraving is in the preparation of the plate, and is not varied by the consideration whether 1 copy or 100,000 are to be struck from it.

The Committee on Printing was another by which "a good thing" might have been made. Mr. Farnham, a most responsible stationer of Washington City, offered to bind the House Documents, octavo volumes, for 10 cents each, and quartos for 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ cents each. The law limits the price of binding octavos to 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per volume, leaving the rest to the discretion of the committee. They accordingly awarded the contract to a back-woods editor, giving him for octavo volumes 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, for quartos 50 cents. Already \$250,000 have been appropriated for binding House Documents, and more will probably be called for. But upon this amount, averaging the difference between Farnham's bid and that of his successful competitor, at only 35 per cent, and it shows the "good thing" of \$87,500 to be divided amongst—who can tell? And although the committee would not entrust the work to Mr. Farnham, the committee's employee did, just transferring the contract and performing no other labor than that of pocketing and, it may be, of distributing the excess.

This subject is too large for a note, and I will probably resume it in another place, adding simply here, that the member who spoke to me of his contemplated arrangements about the engravings, said he had no understanding with any one of the committee, though he knew the bids before they were officially offered, and that I do not know that the Printing Committee was ever *charged* with corruption. I give *facts*, leaving inferences to the "charitable censure" of the public.

*C. G. Dec. 27, 1855.

The debate that ensued elicited the further information that

this same reverend broker in corruption, (for he was a Methodist parson,) had solicited the votes of his colleagues for Mr. Banks under the positive assurance that, if elected, he would arrange his Committees with the special view of promoting Pennsylvania interests. This promise was deemed necessary because it was known Mr. Banks had retained of his democratic education nothing but an ardent advocacy of Free trade, while every Pennsylvania Member who could be induced to vote for him was a protectionist from interest as well as conviction. To relieve their candidate from the charge of making so nefarious a trade for votes, Mr. Pearce and Mr. Campbell, (of Pa.) who, as well as Mr. Covode, had staked their veracity upon his intentions in this regard, curiously explained the grounds of their confidence. It seems that each had convinced the other, who in turn convinced his convincer, that Mr. Banks was "a gentleman of high character," and this premise being granted, the conclusion was inevitable. For they argued, "any gentleman of high character," will constitute his Committees with a special eye to Pennsylvania interests; but Mr. Banks is "a gentleman of high character;" therefore he will constitute his Committees, &c. It is, perhaps, a sign of the degeneracy of this age, that few can be found willing to risk their reputation, and the interests of their State upon a syllogism like this; but very few to credit, the existence of such a trustful nature and such childlike simplicity in others. The presumption, indeed, would rather be that a man of honest convictions would endeavor so to organize the House as to promote that policy which he believes to be beneficial to the whole country. Certainly considering that he had no disposition to meet the checks of his friends upon him in the shape of pledges, never was unfortunate "gentleman of high character" so drawn upon before.

Mr. Alexander K. Marshall, of Kentucky, now begged the House to adjourn for the day, stating that he had information of facts more disgraceful than any which had yet been elicited, and which he had no doubt he would be able to array and to prove in the morning. "I have no reference," he said, "to

rumors, no reference to the visionary floating reports of the day, no reference to bar-room conversations ; but I have reference to direct charges which have been made, which I believe will be made again, and of which, I have no doubt, there is abundant proof—charges, I repeat, which if made and proved here, will prevent any honorable man of any party from continuing to give his vote for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Banks,') That candidate's friends resisted the motion for adjournment, declaring he was triumphantly acquitted of charges they would not allow to be made ; that, like pure gold, he shone the brighter for the rubbing he had got ; and the voting was resumed. After this exhibition of the taste and morals of the majority, any proof of corruption would only have brought ridicule upon the witness, and the subject was suffered to sleep.

The President of the United States, meanwhile, had been regarding these scenes not only with the indignation of a citizen, but with the impatience of a party leader, anxious himself to step into the arena and have a bout with his foes. Determined no longer to be occluded, on the last day of the year his private secretary appeared at the door of the House with the annual message, the announcement of which occasioned mingled surprise and rage. One gentleman moved that "the papers" be returned to the person who brought them ; another that the message be read, assuming it was already received ; another, that it be *received* and read ; another, that it be received and laid on the table.

The Democrats argued, That the Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall elect a Speaker, which is a constitutional recognition of its being a House before its organization, since otherwise it must have a Speaker before it could elect a Speaker ; that a Senate and a House constitute a Congress, with which, under the 3d Section of the 2d Article of the Constitution, the President may communicate at any time he thinks it for the public interest ; that the Executive had heretofore refrained from any attempt to do so before the

Houses were organized, simply because that result had always been obtained in due season ; that it was possible the information he had to communicate would be so important as to hasten the election of a Speaker ; and that while the House could not act upon the suggestions of the message in its present state, it was its duty to hear them ; and a case was cited in which messages had for many days passed between the King, the House of Lords and the Commons of England, before the latter had elected their Speaker.

The Republicans contended that the President could communicate only with *Congress*, a term by no means applicable to a body, one branch of which was unorganized, having no mouth-piece through which to express an opinion ; that the law of 1789 requires, that the Speaker and the members shall be sworn in before any business shall be transacted ; that if the consideration of this message were business, the law would be violated ; if it were not business, it was improperly before them ; that being in violation of all precedent, it was at best an arrogant attempt covertly to rebuke a co-ordinate branch, and if, as was intimated, it was designed to affect their action, then it was a gross violation of privilege.

Various questions of order were raised, and at last it was resolved to lay the pending question of order along with the papers on the table. But the President's object was attained, the message having been received and read in the Senate, and ordered to be printed.

It sets out with an intimation of serious impending difficulties with Great Britain, which was doubtless the card upon which his friends relied to force an immediate organization of the House. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty stipulates that neither power "will ever occupy or fortify or colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa-Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America." Yet that power still exercises large authority over the Mosquito coast, covering the entire length of Nicaragua and part of Costa-Rica ; regards the the Balize as her absolute domain, though she had often by

treaty renounced any such pretensions, and is extending its limits at the expense of Honduras; and formally colonized a considerable group known as the Bay Islands, which rightfully belong to the same State. She justifies herself on the ground that the treaty is prospective only, and was not designed to relinquish any claim she had set up prior to 19th April 1850, the date of its execution. He treated with proper scorn this subterfuge of a nation which in its modern policy has combined the vices of two distant eras of its own history—the rapacity of the Saxon pirate with the canting hypocrisy of the Roundhead and which is never so much to be suspected of a design to rob its neighbor as when in a pious paroxysm before its God. He calls attention also to the attempts to draw recruits from this country against Russia, to be enrolled and enlisted in Halifax, which the British Government acknowledged to be prompted by itself, with a full knowledge of our neutrality laws.

He had on the 14th April, 1855, notified the Danish Government that the treaty existing between us should terminate one year from that date. This was to relieve our commerce from the imposition of tolls on all vessels and cargoes passing into or from the Baltic sea, which he regards as analogous to the tribute formerly levied by the Barbary States upon nations whose ships frequented the Mediterranean.

The difference with France respecting the French Consul at San Francisco, and that with Greece, growing out of the sequestration of property belonging to the American Consul at Athens, had been satisfactorily adjusted.

Spain had made compensation for the illegal seizure of the *Black Hawk*, and for the arbitrary revocation, at the end of three months, of a decree authorizing the importation during six months, of certain building materials and provisions into Cuba, by which American citizens had been seriously injured.

Wrongs done by the Mexican Government had been submitted to because of its disturbed condition; and strenuous efforts had been made to prevent our citizens from interfering in the affairs of Nicaragua.

The receipts from all sources, during the fiscal year ending 3d June, 1855, had been \$65,003,930; the expenditures, \$56,365,293; the payments of public debt, \$9,844,528. The balance in the Treasury 1st July, 1855, \$18,931,976; the receipts and estimated receipts for the year, \$67,918,734, affording as available resources for the current fiscal year, \$86,856,710. The estimated expenditures, \$71,226,846, including the payment of \$3,000,000, to Mexico and of \$7,750,000 to Texas; the remaining public debt is less than \$40,000,000.

The gross receipts of the Post Office Department for the last fiscal year, \$7,342,136, the gross expenditure, \$9,968,342.

The aggregate of public land sold, located with military scrip on land warrants, taken up under grants for roads, and selected by States as swamp lands, during the fiscal year, was 24,557,409 acres, the portion sold being 15,729,524 acres which yielded \$11,485,380,

In the Territory of Kansas there have been acts prejudicial to good order, but as yet none have occurred under circumstances to justify the interposition of the Federal Executive. That could only be in case of obstruction to Federal laws, or of organized resistance to territorial laws, assuming the character of insurrection.

He then reviews the relations existing between the several States of the Confederation, insisting on the original absolute sovereignty of each, as soon as the tie between them and England was severed, "the political result of which was the foundation of a Federal Republic of the free white men of the colonies. As for the subject races, whether African or Indian, the wise and brave statesmen of that day being engaged in no extravagant scheme of social reform, left them as they were." In forming the present Constitution, the States jealously reserved every attribute of sovereignty not essentially necessary to be entrusted to the General Government. This Government, both by the power enumerated and by those not enumerated, and therefore refused to it, cannot attack or defend slavery, except as against invasion or domestic violence. "If one State

ceases to respect the rights of another, and obtrusively meddles with its local interests—if a portion of the States assume to impose their institutions on the others, or refuse to fulfil their obligations to them—we are no longer united, friendly States, but distracted, hostile ones.” “It has been a matter of painful regret to see States, conspicuous for their services in founding this Republic, and equally sharing its advantages, disregard their constitutional obligations to it. Although conscious of their inability to remedy admitted and palpable social evils of their own, and which are completely within their jurisdiction, they engage in the offensive and hopeless undertaking of reforming the domestic institutions of other States wholly beyond their control and authority. In the vain pursuit of ends by them unattainable, and which they may not legally attempt to compass, they peril the very existence of the Constitution, and all the countless benefits which it has conferred. While the people of the Southern States confine their attention to their own affairs, not presuming officiously to intermeddle with the Northern States, too many of the inhabitants of the latter are permanently organized in associations to inflict injury on the former, by wrongful acts, which would be cause of war as between foreign powers and only fail to be such in our system because perpetrated under cover of the Union.” And yet the States “which either promote or tolerate attacks on the rights of person and of property in other States, to disguise their own injustice, pretend or imagine, and constantly aver, that they, whose constitutional rights are thus systematically assailed, are themselves the aggressors.” The particular cause of complaint against the South, is to be found in the political organization of the new Territories.

Yet he declares that the concession of the vast territory north-west of the Ohio River to the interests and opinions of the North was in a great measure the act of Virginia and of the South. Louisiana was an acquisition in territory, as in every other respect, no less to the North than the South. Florida was but the transfer to us of territory east of the Missis-

issippi in exchange for large territory transferred to Spain west of that river. The adoption of the Constitution abrogated the ordinance of 1787, and the Missouri Compromise, unconstitutional in its inception, was submitted to by the South as a sacrifice to the cause of the Union, though violative of the treaty of Louisiana, while the North received it with angry complaint, because it did not concede all they demanded. Texas was annexed with the institutions she had chosen, in spite of the same fanatical opposition which had always opposed the aggrandizement of the country, if at the same time it did not totally enure to the benefit of one section. The struggle was renewed in organizing the territories acquired from Mexico, and again the principles of popular sovereignty triumphed, and the true principle, of leaving each State and Territory to regulate its own laws of labor, had acquired such strength that by common consent it was applied to Washington Territory. And finally the Kansas-Nebraska bill acknowledged in terms, the principle recognized by the legislation attending the organization of Utah, New Mexico, and Washington.

The voting proceeded with the results which the public had learned to regard as inevitable until Wednesday, the 9th January, 1856, when it was announced that the Democratic caucus had resolved to resist any adjournment until a Speaker should be elected, and the other side resolved to accommodate them with a protracted session. Members accordingly laid in a supply of whiskey, sandwiches, and speeches to last out the week, which Mr. Paine of N. C., declared ended at day-light on Sunday morning, "though some men," he added, with contemptuous compassion for their ignorance, "think Sunday commences at 12 o'clock Saturday night."

It would be too tedious to recount minutely what occurred. There was much laughter without wit; much personality without point; set discourses which meant nothing; and explanations which elucidated nothing. Mr. Campbell arraigned Mr. Giddings, indeed, for a letter published by the latter, of which an account has heretofore been given, and Mr. Burnett, of

Kentucky, called attention to a statement supposed to have emanated from Mr. Kelsey, the future chairman of the Engraving committee. A short time before these gentlemen had paired off, and the latter on visiting his constituents, not unwilling to let them see how wise a choice they had made, boasted of some sharp practice, which was thus admiringly recorded in the Genesee (N. Y.) Democrat: "Our Congressman, Hon. Wm. H. Kelsey, made us a flying visit a few days since, returning to his seat in the House on Monday. It is gratifying to his constituents to observe that, during the struggle for Speaker, Mr. Kelsey's vote has uniformly been placed where it will do the most effective service in the cause of freedom. In order to make a visit to his home, he 'paired off' with a member from Alabama—a Richardson man—and Major Williams, of Monroe, whose vote has been among the scattering, making, if we may be allowed the expression, a triple pair." Mr. Kelsey, of course, denied the fraud, and attempted to account for his friend's mistake, in doing which he denounced some one of his District, who had enclosed the strip from the Democrat to various individuals in Washington. "I do not propose," he added, "to notice any thing *coming from that quarter*. When any charge against me has a *has a respectable or even a decent backer*, I will meet every question which gentlemen *here or elsewhere* choose to raise against me." Mr. Burnett said, "I want to know to whom the gentleman applied the latter portion of his remark?" Mr. Kelsey. "I applied it to *the writer of the letter enclosing the slip*."

I have forborne to record the scenes of disorder and confusion which had marked almost every day of the session. As the contest was protracted the attendance at the Capitol of the idle public congregated in Washington became greater and their interest more boisterously expressed. Noisy factions divided the galleries no less than the floor, each cheering its champions with vehement applause, and expressing its scorn of their opponents by groans and hisses; rival orators began to address them for sympathy and encouragement; and, as in a

theatre, stamps, clapping of hands, and every noisy exhibition of approbation welcomed the appearance of a favorite actor or the enunciation of a favorite party catch-word. But on this occasion "the gods," hopeless of equaling the rank license below, subsided into sobriety, and the "lord of misrule" held almost exclusive sway among the members. One gentleman *would* raise points of order on the roll-call, and insist on his rights, as the representative of so proud and intelligent a district, to address himself to the no-question before the House; another held maudlin debate with his chair, before which he stood, (when not lurching,) and gesticulated with irresistible gravity; amidst the buz of voices and the noise of gentlemen passing to or from the refreshment room, a dozen were at the same time screaming in their loudest key to the bewildered clerk; while loud snores from the sofas and desks around attested that the "flow of soul" had incapacitated many from enjoying this "feast of reason." At last those who had resolved to test the qualifications of the candidate by the physical endurance of his adherents, began to tire of the notable scheme. They found, to their surprise, that not a vote had been changed to either side: that nothing is more persistent than party spirit exalted with alcoholic stimulants, and that the worst way to conciliate a patriot is to wake him up, when fuddled, every half hour for a fresh vote. Accordingly, at 8 o'clock Thursday morning, the House adjourned till 12 the next day.

The House now resolved to request each of the candidates to answer the following questions, originally intended by the mover for Mr. Richardson alone:*

1. Whether he regards the Kansas-Nebraska bill as promotive of the formation of free States in that Territory.

Mr. Richardson did not believe slavery would go there, but this did not govern his vote, which was given because he thought the majority of the people there should determine this question for themselves. Mr. Banks did not think it tended to the formation of free States, as it repealed the prohibition of slavery.

*Id. January 12.

Mr. Fuller did not believe it promotive of the formation of either free or slave States.

2. Is the Wilmot proviso constitutional? Did he in 1850 oppose its application to the Territories acquired from Mexico only because he thought it unnecessary, the local law having already abolished it? And did he declare that if the territorial bills, silent on this subject, should be defeated, he would vote for others with the Wilmot proviso?

Mr. Richardson believed Congress had power to exclude slavery from the Territories, though its exercise would be urgent. He had hastily said he would vote for Territorial bills with the Wilmot proviso, if those free from it did not pass, and he now repudiated the sentiment as unjust and improper. Mr. Banks thought Congress had the power and ought to exercise it. Mr. Fuller held that Congress had no authority to interfere with the subject at all.

3. Does the Constitution carry slavery into the Territories?

Mr. Richardson answered affirmatively, but since it required territorial laws for its protection, the question was practically with the people there. Mr. Banks held the negative, and Mr. Fuller, the affirmative.

To other questions Mr. Richardson responded that he belonged to no secret political organization; was opposed to abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, national dock yards, &c; discriminated against no man for his birth place or religion, and believed the negro inferior to the white man. Mr. Banks would say nothing on Americanism, and while he believed all men are created equal, he thought the relative powers of the white and black races could be determined only by their endurance, and he would express no opinion until it could be seen which would absorb the other. He would inhibit slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, and had no opinion on the subject of abolishing it in the District, or about the tariff. Mr. Fuller was opposed to all Congressional legislation on slavery; did not believe in the equality of whites and blacks, and interfered with no man's religion.

On the 23d January, Mr. Richardson stated that on the next day he should withdraw his name, which he accordingly did, 122 votings having been had. In his place the Democats took up James L. Orr, of South Carolina, a gentleman of much experience and middling capacity, less extreme in his Southern views than most politicians of his State. The same day a message from the President was received, and, after much violent debate and confusion, was read. It states that the Govenor of Kansas had so neglected his duties as to defer the first meeting of its legislature to the 2d July, 1855, though himself appointed 29th June, 1854. Before the requisite preparation for the election of a legislature, a delegate had been elected to Congress, who took his seat without challenge. The anti-slavery party had determined to force their views upon the Territory by a propagandist colorization of it, which naturally awakened intense indignation in the contiguous States, and particularly in Missouri, whose domestic peace was threatened by the movement. Charges of friends, violence and illegal voting were made on all sides; but the Govenor, to whom alone the law confided the duty, canvassed the returns, deduced a large majority of the members of the Council and the House to be duly elected, and ordered a new election to fill the places of those not properly returned. He convened the Assembly at Pawnee City, a proposed town site which he and others were attempting unlawfully to locate on a military reservation, for which the President had removed him and a Court Martial had sentenced an officer to be dismissed from the army. After the usual official communications had passed between him and the Assembly, that body removed to Shawnee, Missouri, on which ground alone the Governor refused to recognize the validity of their acts. A delegate was elected under a law of this Assembly, and subsequently a portion of the people, without color of law, proceeded to elect another delegate. Following upon this movement was a more important one of the same character. A mere party of the inhabitants, without law, summoned a Convention to frame a Constitution, and elected a Governor and a Representative

to Congress as a State. This is of a revolutionary tendency, and will become treasonable insurrection if sustained by forcible organized resistance to the authority of the General Government, in which event the President will use the force at his command to maintain order. He recommends that Congress authorize the inhabitants of Kansas, as soon as they shall be of sufficient numbers, to form a State government, and asks a special appropriation to defray the expenses that may be incurred in executing the laws and maintaining public order.

On the 2d of February the House resolved that if, after three trials, no candidate should have a majority, then the one having the greatest number of votes should be declared Speaker. Immediately after Mr. Orr withdrew, and his colleague, William Aiken, a gentleman not of great ability, indeed, but of spotless integrity and exceedingly amiable character, who, moreover, could be supported by the National Americans, since he had attended no Democratic caucus, was nominated in his stead. Mr. Fuller also withdrew, but was to the last supported by six National Americans, in consequence of which Mr. Banks received 103 votes; Mr. Aiken, 100; scattering, 11, it being the 133d voting.

After the House adopted the plurality rule the excitement became intense. The floor was crowded with strangers, who had no right there; it was impossible to keep the Members in their seats or preserve the slightest semblance of order; and the announcement of the result was received with repeated cheers and hisses. Thus ended the fiercest legislation conflict, unaccompanied by personal violence, that ever occurred, and Mr. Banks was inducted to a seat he had conquered from a most reluctant house by showing that he had the power and the purpose to keep it for ever unorganized rather than withdraw his claims. His partisans had denounced as the basest treachery every attempt to look elsewhere in the Republican ranks for an available candidate; lugubrious complaints were at once made that the enemy, who, it was ascertained, were just prepared to surrender, had been inspirited by such treason to take up their

arms again; and Mr. Campbell incurred additional odium because it was demonstrated by the vote on a Resolution declaring him Speaker, (16 January,) though against his will, that if the Banks men had voted for him he would have been elected.

By resolutions William Cullem, of Tennessee, (National American,) was elected Clerk; Adam J. Glossbrenner, of Pennsylvania, (Democrat,) Sergeant at Arms; Nathan Darling, of N. Y., (Know Nothing,) Door Keeper; and Robert Morriss, of Pennsylvania, (American,) Post Master. On the 6th February, nominations were made for Public Printer, and on the 13th, after eleven votings, Cornelius Wendell, (Democrat,) was elected.

It may seem strange that a House so intensely anti-democratic, should have elected Democrats to two important offices. But Mr. Glossbrenner, in addition to being a very good officer, had held over the same position from the last session, and while the protracted struggle for Speaker was going on, many of its valiant participants would have been starved into a surrender but for his timely aid. The gratitude that prompted the election of Mr. Wendell is supposed to have been of that more ordinary kind which is thankful for favors expected, and will become the subject of particular examination hereafter.

The organization of the House was completed by the annunciation of the following committees:

Committee on Elections—Israel Washburn of Maine, Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, Cooper K. Watson of Ohio, Francis E. Spinner of New York, Mordecai Oliver of Missouri, John Hickman of Pennsylvania, Schuyler Colfax of Indiana, William R. Smith of Alabama, and John A. Bingham, of Ohio.

Of Ways and Means—Lewis D. Campbell of Ohio, William A. Howard of Michigan, Howell Cobb of Georgia, George W. Jones of Tennessee, Henry Winter Davis of Maryland, Russell Sage of New York, John S. Phelps of Missouri, James H. Campbell of Pennsylvania, and Alexander DeWit of Massachusetts.

On Claims—Joshua R. Giddings of Ohio, John Letcher of Virginia, James Bishop of New Jersey, J. Glancey Jones of Pennsylvania, George G. Dunn of Indiana, Ebenezer Knowlton of Maine, Miles Taylor of Louisiana, William A. Gilbert of New York, and Samuel S. Marshall of Illinois.

On Commerce—Ellihu B. Washburne of Illinois, Edward Wade of Ohio, John S. Millson of Virginia, John McQueen of South Carolina, Job R. Tyson of Pennsylvania, Luther M. Kennett of Missouri, Guy R. Pelton of New York, Linus B. Comins of Massachusetts, and George Eustis of Louisiana.

On Public Lands—Henry Bennett of New York, Aaron Harlan of Ohio, Williamson R. W. Cobb of Alabama, James J. Lindley of Missouri, Elisha D. Cullen of Delaware, David S. Walbridge of Michigan, Samuel Brenton of Indiana, Augustus E. Maxwell of Florida, and James Thorington of Iowa.

On the Post Office and Post Roads.—Daniel Mace of Indiana, Jesse O. Norton of Illinois, Thomas T. Flagler of New York, David Barclay of Pennsylvania, Timothy C. Day of Ohio, Paulus Powell of Virginia, Percy Walker of Alabama, John M. Wood of Maine, and Philip T. Herbert of California.

On the District of Columbia.—James Meacham of Vermont, Edward Dodd of New York, William O. Goode of Virginia, William Cumbach of Indiana, John Dick of Pennsylvania, J. Morrison Harris of Maryland, Hendley S. Bennett of Mississippi, Mark Trafton of Massachusetts, and Peter H. Bell of Texas.

On the Judiciary.—George A. Simmons of New York, Humphrey Marshall of Kentucky, Lucian Barbour of Indiana, John S. Caskie of Virginia, Samuel Galloway of Ohio, Sampson W. Harris of Alabama, William A. Lake of Mississippi, Abraham Wakeman of New York, and Mason W. Tappan of New Hampshire.

On Revolutionary Claims.—David Ritchie of Pennsylvania, Ambrose S. Murray of New York, William Smith of Virginia, William H. English of Indiana, Thomas J. D. Fuller of Maine, James C. Allen of Illinois, Isaiah D. Clawson of New Jersey, Aaron H. Cragin of New Hampshire, and J. Reece Emrie of Ohio.

On Public Expenditures.—Sidney Dean of Connecticut, John Covode of Pennsylvania, John Kelly of New York, Richard Mott of Ohio, John J. Pearce of Pennsylvania, George Vail of New Jersey, John M. Elliott of Kentucky, Henry Waldron of Michigan, and Lawrence O'B. Branch of North Carolina.

On Private Land Claims.—Gilchrist Porter of Missouri, Valentine B. Horton of Ohio, James Thorington of Iowa, Emerson Etheridge of Tennessee, Thomas F. Bowie of Maryland, John M. Sandidge of Louisiana, Philip T. Herbert of Califor-

nia, David F. Robison of Pennsylvania, and Thomas R. Horton of New York.

On Manufactures.—Ezra Clark of Connecticut, Jonathan Knight of Pennsylvania, Martin J. Crawford of Georgia, Philemon Bliss of Ohio, Nathaniel B. Durfee of Rhode Island, Francis S. Edwards of New York, James F. Dowdell of Alabama, John P. Campbell of Kentucky, and James B. Ricaud of Maryland.

On Agriculture.—David P. Halloway of Indiana, Charles Ready of Tennessee, Galusha A. Grow of Pennsylvania, Peter H. Bell of Texas, Lewis D. Campbell of Ohio, Edwin B. Morgan of New York, Alvah Sabin of Vermont, Elisha D. Cullen of Delaware, and Fayette McMullen of Virginia.

On Indian Affairs.—Benjamin Bringle of New York, James L. Orr of South Carolina, Charles Billingham of Wisconsin, Alfred B. Greenwood of Arkansas, Benjamin F. Leiter of Ohio, Robert B. Hall of Massachusetts, Lemuel Todd of Pennsylvania, Samuel Caruthers of Missouri, and Philip T. Herbert of California.

On Military Affairs.—John A. Quitman of Mississippi, John Allison of Pennsylvania, William R. Sapp of Ohio, Charles J. Faulkner of Virginia, John Williams of New York, Benjamin Stanton of Ohio, James W. Denver of California, James Buffington of Massachusetts, and Cadwalader C. Washburne of Wisconsin.

On the Militia.—John C. Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Thomas R. Whitney of New York, John Scott Harrison of Ohio, Henry W. Hoffman of Maryland, Nathaniel G. Foster of Georgia, John M. Parker of New York, Albert G. Watkins of Tennessee, Daniel B. Wright of Mississippi, and Robert B. Hall of Massachusetts.

On Naval Affairs.—Samuel P. Benson of Maine, James S. T. Stranahan of New York, Thomas S. Bocock of Virginia, Solomon G. Haven of New York, Warren Winslow of North Carolina, James S. Seward of Georgia, Timothy Davis of Massachusetts, William W. Boyce of South Carolina, and William Millward of Pennsylvania.

On Foreign Affairs.—Alexander C. M. Pennington of New Jersey, Thomas H. Bayly of Virginia, Thomas L. Clingman of North Carolina, William Aiken of South Carolina, Henry M. Fuller of Pennsylvania, Orsamus B. Matteson of New York, Benjamin B. Thurston of Rhode Island, John Sherman of Ohio, and Anson Burlingame of Massachusetts.

On Territories.—Galusha A. Grow of Pennsylvania, Joshua

R. Giddings of Ohio, Samuel A. Purviance of Pennsylvania, William A. Richardson of Illinois, George S. Houston of Alabama, Amos P. Granger of New York, Felix K. Zollicoffer of Tennessee, Justin S. Morrill of Vermont, and John S. Perry of Maine.

On Revolutionary Pensions.—Jacob Broom of Pennsylvania, Charles J. Albright of Ohio, Henry A. Edmundson of Virginia, Killian Miller of New York, Smith Miller of Indiana, Burton Craige of North Carolina, Chauncey L. Knapp of Massachusetts, John Woodruff of Connecticut, and Augustus Hall of Iowa.

On Invalid Pensions.—Andrew Oliver of New York, James Pike of New Hampshire, Thomas B. Florence of Pennsylvania, John H. Savage of Tennessee, William W. Welch of Connecticut, Albert G. Talbott of Kentucky, Samuel Dickson of New York, John H. Lumpkin of Georgia, and George R. Robbins of New Jersey.

On Roads and Canals.—James Knox of Illinois, Jonas A. Hughston of New York, Thomas Ruffin of North Carolina, Harvey D. Scott of Indiana, George W. Peck of Michigan, Oscar F. Moore of Ohio, William Barksdale of Mississippi, Samuel C. Bradshaw of Pennsylvania, and Albert Rust of Arkansas.

On Patents.—Edwin B. Morgan of New York, Calvin C. Chaffee of Massachusetts, Samuel A. Smith of Tennessee, Robert T. Paine of North Carolina, and John R. Edie of Pennsylvania.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Edward Ball of Ohio, Samuel Todd of Pennsylvania, Richard C. Puryear of North Carolina, Lawrence M. Keitt of South Carolina, and Anthony E. Roberts of Pennsylvania.

On Revisal and Unfinished Business.—Alvah Sabin of Vermont, Ebenezer Knowlton of Maine, Hiram Warner of Georgia, Bayard Clark of New York, and Eli S. Shorter of Alabama.

On Accounts.—Benjamin B. Thurston of Rhode Island, John Cadwalader of Pennsylvania, Mathias S. Nichols of Ohio, James Buffington of Massachusetts, and John S. Carlile of Virginia.

On Mileage.—William H. Sneed of Tennessee, Preston S. Brooks of South Carolina, William H. Kelsey of New York, Lemuel D. Evans of Texas, and James H. Woodworth of Illinois.

On Engraving.—William H. Kelsey of New York, William

S. Damrell of Massachusetts, and John V. Wright of Tennessee.

On Expenditures in the State Department.—Preston S. Brooks of South Carolina, Samuel A. Smith of Tennessee, Asa Packer of Pennsylvania, Rufus H. King of New York, and William S. Damrell of Massachusetts.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Henry Waldron of Michigan, Daniel Wells of Wisconsin, Alexander K. Marshall of Kentucky, Zedekiah Kidwell of Virginia, Isaiah D. Clawson of New Jersey.

On Expenditures in the War Department.—Aaron H. Craigin of New York, William W. Valk of New York, Joshua H. Jewett of Kentucky, Thomas Rivers of Tennessee, and John Covode of Pennsylvania.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Thomas L. Harris of Illinois, John Wheeler of New York, Cadwalader C. Washburne of Wisconsin, Warner L. Underwood of Kentucky, and John V. Wright of Tennessee.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department.—John M. Pettit of Indiana, Leander M. Cox of Kentucky, John Williams of New York, Henry C. Burnett of Kentucky, and Edwin G. Reade of North Carolina.

On Expenditures on the Public Buildings.—Fayette McMullin of Virginia, Andrew Z. McCarty of New York, James A. Stewart of Maryland, Samuel F. Swope of Kentucky, and Robert P. Trippe of Georgia.

Joint Committee on the Library.—William Aiken of South Carolina, Job R. Tyson of Pennsylvania, and John U. Pettit of Indiana.

Joint Committee on Printing.—Mathias H. Nichols of Ohio, Aaron H. Craigin of New Hampshire, and Thomas T. Flagler of New York.

Joint Committee on Enrolled Bills.—James Pike of New Hampshire, and Thomas G. Davidson of Louisiana



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 006 875 673 A